

# **Audit**



# **Report**

OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL

**SELECTED SPECIAL-PURPOSE  
TELECOMMUNICATIONS CIRCUITS**

Report No. 94-173

August 8, 1994

**Department of Defense**

### **Additional Copies**

To obtain additional copies of this report, contact the Secondary Reports Distribution Unit, Audit Planning and Technical Support Directorate, at (703) 604-8937 (DSN 664-8937) or FAX (703) 604-8932.

### **Suggestions for Future Audits**

To suggest ideas for or to request future audits, contact the Planning and Coordination Branch, Audit Planning and Technical Support Directorate, at (703) 604-8939 (DSN 664-8939) or FAX (703) 604-8932. Ideas and requests can also be mailed to:

Inspector General, Department of Defense  
OAIG-AUD (ATTN: APTS Audit Suggestions)  
400 Army Navy Drive (Room 801)  
Arlington, Virginia 22202-2884

### **DoD Hotline**

To report fraud, waste, or abuse, call the DoD Hotline at (800) 424-9098 or write to the DoD Hotline, The Pentagon, Washington, D.C. 20301-1900. The identity of writers and callers is fully protected.

### **Acronyms**

CCSD	Command Communications Service Designator
CSA	Communications Service Authorization
DSN	Defense Switched Network
NAS	Naval Air Station



**INSPECTOR GENERAL  
DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE  
400 ARMY NAVY DRIVE  
ARLINGTON, VIRGINIA 22202-2884**

Report No. 94-173

August 8, 1994

**MEMORANDUM FOR ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE NAVY (FINANCIAL  
MANAGEMENT)  
AUDITOR GENERAL, DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY**

**SUBJECT: Audit Report on Selected Special-Purpose Telecommunications Circuits  
(Project No. 3RD-0008)**

## **Introduction**

We are providing this memorandum report for your information and use. This report is the first of three reports resulting from the review of requirements for special-purpose voice circuits as part of Project No. 3RD-0008, "Audit of the DoD Management of Circuit Configurations for Defense Switched Network Access Requirements." This report discusses disconnecting special-purpose voice circuits that are no longer required by the Departments of the Army and Navy.

## **Audit Results**

Six DoD installations were paying about \$61,248 annually for nine special-purpose voice circuits that were no longer required. Those circuits either were no longer needed to support a telecommunications mission or were no longer being used. When this condition was brought to managements' attention at each installation, management took action to disconnect the circuits. The disconnection of those circuits will reduce long-haul communications costs by about \$386,000 for a 72-month period ending in FY 2000. See Enclosure 1 for details on the disconnected circuits and Enclosure 2 for a summary of the potential monetary benefits.

## **Objective**

The overall objective of the audit was to evaluate the DoD management of circuit configurations for Defense Switched Network (DSN) access requirements. The specific objective of this segment of the audit was to verify the requirements for special-purpose voice circuits that were part of the audit sample.

## **Scope and Methodology**

The universe for the overall audit was composed of DoD installations within the continental United States using DSN access circuits. Those installations were also using 2,934 special-purpose (also referred to as dedicated or point-to-point) voice circuits, recorded in the Defense Information Services Database System, that cost about \$39.6 million annually. The audit cutoff date of the universe

---

data was June 30, 1993. Point-to-point voice circuits were included in the universe to determine whether those circuits were accessing the DSN. As part of the audit, installations using DSN access circuits were grouped into 153 geographical regions where concentrations of circuits existed. For the purposes of the overall audit, we randomly selected a statistical sample of 28 geographical regions from the 153 geographical regions. Those 28 regions used 646 point-to-point voice circuits that cost about \$10.0 million annually. During the survey phase of the audit, we examined circuits in 6 of the 28 geographic regions. Those 6 regions used 160 point-to-point voice circuits that cost about \$2.4 million. This report discusses the results of our review of those 160 point-to-point voice circuits. For this segment of the audit, we calculated the monetary benefits for only those six regions without the use of statistical projection techniques. Statistical techniques were used only to project the results of the overall audit.

During the audit, we reviewed Telecommunication Service Requests, Telecommunication Service Orders, administrative messages, and other historical documentation, dated from April 1968 to April 1994, describing the purpose and physical location of the circuits. We reviewed current and historical records showing justifications for circuits and examined the physical locations of each sampled circuit. We contacted organizations within the Military Departments, Defense agencies, and the Defense Information Systems Agency identified as having knowledge about the use of or requirements for a circuit. The contacts helped to determine whether the requirements for the circuits were valid. To determine whether a circuit was justified, a need to communicate must have existed on June 30, 1993, and the user must have been able to physically locate the sample circuit. We did not assess the reliability of computer-processed data, provided by the Defense Commercial Communications Office, that were used to perform the audit. We used the computer-processed data to select the audit sample of circuits to review. Any inaccuracies in those data will not affect the results of the audit.

This economy and efficiency audit was made from June 1993 through April 1994 as part of the overall audit project. The audit was made in accordance with auditing standards issued by the Comptroller General of the United States as implemented by the Inspector General, DoD. A list of organizations visited or contacted is in Enclosure 4.

## **Internal Controls**

Due to the limited scope of this segment of the audit, we did not assess internal controls.

## **Prior Audits and Other Reviews**

Seven prior Inspector General, DoD, audit reports showed that problems similar to those discussed in this report occurred regarding telecommunications circuits that were no longer required. Details on those audits are in Enclosure 3.

---

## Background

DoD Directive 4640.13, "Management of Base and Long-Haul Telecommunications Equipment and Services," December 5, 1991, establishes DoD policy, assigns responsibilities, and prescribes procedures to ensure effective, efficient, and economical use of base and long-haul telecommunications equipment and services. That Directive requires a biennial review and revalidation of all existing long-haul telecommunications requirements to verify that circuits no longer needed are disconnected. Specifically, the Directive states that the DoD Components shall discontinue telecommunications equipment or services for which a bona fide need no longer exists.

## Circuit Disconnections

One Army and five Navy installations had a total of nine point-to-point voice circuits that were no longer required. Disconnection of those nine circuits would avoid telecommunications expenditures of \$385,778 during a 72-month period, starting in FY 1994 and ending in FY 2000. A synopsis of conditions at each of the six installations is provided below.

**Fort Bragg, Fayetteville, North Carolina.** The installation was paying \$1,778 a month, or \$21,336 annually, for two point-to-point voice circuits that had been used for command and control actions. Discussions with management showed that the circuits were not in use and could be disconnected with no detriment to the users' mission. As a result, management promptly submitted a Request for Service to disconnect the two circuits. Disconnecting the two circuits will allow \$134,179 to be put to better use during the 72-month period.

**Naval Weapons Station Concord, Concord, California.** The installation was paying \$1,146 a month, or \$13,752 annually, for two point-to-point voice circuits that were part of a multipoint circuit used for movement of special weapons. In November 1993, telecommunications personnel at the Naval Communications Station Stockton, Stockton, California, initiated Requests for Service to disconnect four of the multipoint locations; however, telecommunications personnel overlooked the Naval Weapons Station Concord portion of the circuit. After we informed responsible personnel of the oversight, management initiated a Request for Service to disconnect the two circuits. Disconnecting the two circuits will allow management to put \$86,906 to better use during the 72-month period.

**Naval Air Station (NAS) Alameda, Alameda, California.** NAS Alameda was paying \$1,010 a month, or \$12,120 annually, for a point-to-point voice circuit used to send aircraft movement messages to and from NAS Moffett Field, Sunnyvale, California, and the Naval Auxiliary Landing Field Crows Landing, Crows Landing, California. Our discussions with user officials showed that the circuit was no longer required. As a result, management at NAS Alameda initiated a Request for Service to disconnect the circuit. By disconnecting the circuit, management can put \$76,345 to better use during the 72-month period.

---

**NAS Corpus Christi, Corpus Christi, Texas.** The installation was paying \$528 a month, or \$6,336 annually, for a point-to-point voice circuit that had been used as a ship-to-shore air traffic control circuit connecting NAS Corpus Christi and NAS Chase Field, Beeville, Texas. However, when NAS Chase Field closed in February 1993, the circuit was not disconnected. When management was informed that the circuit was still active, officials promptly submitted a Request for Service for disconnection. Disconnecting the circuit will allow management to put \$39,716 to better use during the 72-month period.

**Mare Island Naval Shipyard, Vallejo, California.** The installation was paying \$362 a month, or \$4,344 annually, for two point-to-point voice circuits that had been used as connections between Mare Island Naval Shipyard and Naval Station Treasure Island, San Francisco. Management officials thought that the circuits had been disconnected in 1992; however, management was unable to provide documentation showing that disconnections occurred. As a result, management initiated a Request for Service to disconnect the two circuits. In disconnecting the two circuits, management can put \$27,364 to better use during the 72-month period.

**NAS Kingsville, Kingsville, Texas.** The installation was paying \$280 a month, or \$3,360 annually, for a point-to-point circuit that had not been used since 1990. The circuit had been reawarded under a new Communications Service Authorization and assigned a new Command Communications Service Designator (CCSD) in 1990. Management at NAS Kingsville had not prepared a Request for Service to disconnect the previous CCSD until the audit identified it as active. The Naval Computer and Telecommunications Station Pensacola, Pensacola, Florida, prepared a Request for Service to disconnect the circuit in April 1994. Disconnecting the circuit will provide \$21,268 to be put to better use during the 72-month period.

The table below summarizes the annual costs for the circuits at the six installations and the funds that could be put to better use after disconnections.

**Summary of Costs Related to Installation Circuits**

<u>Installations</u>	<u>Annual Costs</u>	<u>Funds Put To Better Use For 72-Month Period</u>
Fort Bragg	\$21,336	\$134,179
Naval Weapons Station Concord	13,752	86,906
NAS Alameda	12,120	76,345
NAS Corpus Christi	6,336	39,716
Mare Island Naval Shipyard	4,344	27,364
NAS Kingsville	<u>3,360</u>	<u>21,268</u>
Totals	<u>\$61,248</u>	<u>\$385,778</u>

---

The prompt actions taken by the installations to disconnect unnecessary circuits are commendable and preclude the need for recommendations.

### **Management Comments**

We provided a draft of this report to the Departments of the Army and Navy on June 17, 1994. Because there were no recommendations, no comments were required of management, and none were received. Any comments on this final report should be provided by September 7, 1994.

The courtesies extended to the audit staff are appreciated. If you have any questions on this audit, please contact Mr. Robert M. Murrell, Audit Program Director, at (703) 604-9506 (DSN 664-9506) or Mr. Eric B. Edwards, Audit Project Manager, at (703) 604-9534 (DSN 664-9534). Enclosure 5 lists the planned distribution of this report.

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Robert J. Lieberman".

Robert J. Lieberman  
Assistant Inspector General  
for Auditing

Enclosures





## Schedule of Circuits Recommended for Disconnection

<u>2</u> CCSD	<u>Description</u>	<u>From</u>	<u>To</u>	<u>3</u> CSA	<u>1</u> Leased Costs	
					<u>Monthly Recurring Costs</u>	<u>Annual Cost To DoD</u>
UKKV 7HHY	VOICE CIRCUIT	FTBRAGG <sup>4</sup>	FTCMPBL <sup>5</sup>	AT P 04067	\$ 937	\$11,244
UKKV 7H4L	VOICE CIRCUIT	FTBRAGG	FTSTEWRT <sup>6</sup>	AT P 89704 251	841	10,092
BUMV 7GZN	VOICE CIRCUIT	CONCORD <sup>7</sup>	STOCKTON <sup>8</sup>	AT P 89706 392	573	6,876
BUMV 7GZP	VOICE CIRCUIT	CONCORD	STOCKTON	AT P 89704 921	573	6,876
BUBV 7JYM	VOICE CIRCUIT	ALAMEDA <sup>9</sup>	MOFFETT <sup>10</sup>	AT 06 P 02847	1,010	12,120
BZMV 7PBE	VOICE CIRCUIT	CRPSCHR <sup>11</sup>	CHASEFLD <sup>12</sup>	SW 30 P 02257	528	6,336
BABV 7LFV	VOICE CIRCUIT	MARE <sup>13</sup>	TREASURE <sup>14</sup>	PT 03 P 03351	181	2,172
BABV 7LFW	VOICE CIRCUIT	MARE	TREASURE	PT 03 P 03352	181	2,172
BABV 7KRE	VOICE CIRCUIT	KINGSVLL <sup>15</sup>	ORANGGRV <sup>16</sup>	SW 30 P 02238	280	3,360
Total Annual Funds Put To Better Use Resulting From Disconnection Actions						<u>\$61,248</u>

See footnotes on next page.

# Schedule of Circuits Recommended for Disconnection (cont'd)

## Footnotes

- <sup>1</sup>The costs of leased telecommunications services are paid by the Defense Commercial Communications Office, Defense Information Systems Agency, to communications vendors. The costs shown on the schedule are the net costs to the Government.
- <sup>2</sup>Command Communications Service Designator.
- <sup>3</sup>Communications Service Authorization - identifies specific contract with the vendor for each service.
- <sup>4</sup>Fort Bragg, Fayetteville, North Carolina.
- <sup>5</sup>Fort Campbell, Clarksville, Tennessee.
- <sup>6</sup>Fort Stewart, Hinesville, Georgia.
- <sup>7</sup>Naval Weapons Station Concord, Concord, California.
- <sup>8</sup>Naval Communications Station Stockton, Stockton, California.
- <sup>9</sup>Naval Air Station Alameda, Alameda, California.
- <sup>10</sup>Naval Air Station Moffett Field, Sunnyvale, California. and Naval Auxiliary Landing Field Crows Landing, Crows Landing, California.
- <sup>11</sup>Naval Air Station Corpus Christi, Corpus Christi, Texas.
- <sup>12</sup>Naval Air Station Chase Field, Beeville, Texas.
- <sup>13</sup>Mare Island Naval Shipyard, Vallejo, California.
- <sup>14</sup>Naval Station Treasure Island, San Francisco, California.
- <sup>15</sup>Naval Air Station Kingsville, Kingsville, Texas.
- <sup>16</sup>Naval Auxiliary Landing Field Orange Grove, Orange Grove, Texas.

# Summary of Potential Benefits Resulting from Audit

Program	Element Title/ Element No.	FY 1994 <sup>2</sup>	FY 1995	FY 1996	FY 1997	FY 1998	FY 1999	FY 2000 <sup>3</sup>	72-Month <sup>1</sup> Total
1&C <sup>4</sup>	Long-Haul Communications								
	0303126A	\$12,446	\$21,336	\$21,827	\$22,329	\$22,854	\$23,402	\$ 9,985	\$134,179
	0303126N	<u>18,408</u>	<u>39,912</u>	<u>40,830</u>	<u>41,769</u>	<u>42,751</u>	<u>43,777</u>	<u>24,152</u>	<u>251,599</u>
Total Recurring									
Funds Put To Better Use		<u>\$30,854</u>	<u>\$61,248</u>	<u>\$62,657</u>	<u>\$64,098</u>	<u>\$65,605</u>	<u>\$67,179</u>	<u>\$34,137</u>	<u>\$385,778</u>

## Footnotes

<sup>1</sup>This chart summarizes the recurring funds (Appropriation - Operation and Maintenance) based on the audit results identified in Enclosure 1. Using the FY 1995 annual recurring cost avoidances (\$61,248) for the base year, we applied the established DoD inflation factors (2.3 percent for FY 1996, 2.3 percent for FY 1997, 2.35 percent for FY 1998, 2.4 percent for FY 1999, and 2.4 percent for FY 2000) for the 72-month period ending in FY 2000 and calculated the total recurring funds put to better use at \$385,778.

<sup>2</sup>We calculated funds put to better use for FY 1994 for the following CCSDs beginning with the month the circuit was scheduled for disconnection.

BZMV 7PBE was calculated from January 1, 1994, through September 30, 1994.

UKKV 7HHY and UKKV 7H4L were calculated from March 1, 1994, through September 30, 1994.

BABV 7LFV, BABV 7LFW, and BUBV 7JYM were calculated from April 1, 1994, through September 30, 1994.

BUMV 7GZN and BUMV 7GZP were calculated from June 1, 1994, through September 30, 1994.

BABV 7KRE was calculated from July 1, 1994, through September 30, 1994.

<sup>3</sup>We calculated funds put to better use for FY 2000 for the following CCSDs for the following months.

BZMV 7PBE was calculated from October 1, 1999, through December 31, 1999.

UKKV 7HHY and UKKV 7H4L were calculated from October 1, 1999, through February 28, 2000.

BABV 7LFV, BABV 7LFW, and BUBV 7JYM were calculated from October 1, 1999, through March 31, 2000.

BUMV 7GZN and BUMV 7GZP were calculated from October 1, 1999, through May 31, 2000.

BABV 7KRE was calculated from October 1, 1999, through June 30, 2000.

<sup>4</sup>Intelligence and Communications



---

## Prior Audits and Other Reviews

Seven prior Inspector General, DoD, audit reports showed that similar problems occurred regarding telecommunications circuits that were no longer required.

**Office of the Inspector General, DoD, Report No. 94-120, "Telecommunications Circuit Allocation Programs - Jacksonville Area," June 6, 1994.** The audit showed that reconfiguration opportunities were not effectively identified and the requirements were not adequately revalidated. The report states that 63.3 percent of the 166 sample Command Communications Service Designators (CCSDs) reviewed at DoD and non-DoD organizations in the Jacksonville, Florida, metropolitan area were potentially not cost-effective in their configurations or were no longer required. For the sampled CCSDs, the report identified 74 (44.6 percent) circuits as candidates for potential reconfiguration. Leases for 31 (18.7 percent) other circuits could be terminated because they were no longer required. The audit determined that \$9.6 million could be put to better use if circuits are either reconfigured or terminated in the Jacksonville area during the execution of the FY 1994 through FY 1999 Future Years Defense Program. Finally, for that same period, about \$1.5 million could be put to better use if 28 circuits that were not part of the audit universe or sample are reconfigured or terminated.

**Office of the Inspector General, DoD, Report No. 94-072, "Telecommunications Circuit Allocation Programs - Kansas City Area," March 31, 1994.** The audit showed that reconfiguration opportunities were not effectively identified and that requirements were not adequately revalidated. The report states that 63.1 percent of the 92 sample CCSDs reviewed at DoD organizations in the Kansas City, Missouri, metropolitan area were either potentially not cost-effective in their configurations or were no longer required. For the sampled CCSDs, the report identified 33 (35.9 percent) circuits as candidates for potential reconfiguration. Leases for 25 (27.2 percent) other circuits could be terminated because they were no longer required. The audit determined that \$7.9 million could be put to better use if circuits are either reconfigured or terminated in the Kansas City area during the execution of the FY 1994 through FY 1997 Future Years Defense Program. Finally, for that same period, about \$1.3 million could be put to better use if 21 circuits that were not part of the audit universe or sample are terminated.

**Office of the Inspector General, DoD, Report No. 94-051, "Telecommunications Circuit Allocation Programs - San Antonio Area," March 11, 1994.** The audit showed that reconfiguration opportunities were not effectively identified and that requirements were not adequately revalidated. The report states that 47.6 percent of the 193 sample CCSDs reviewed at DoD organizations in the San Antonio, Texas, metropolitan area were either potentially not cost-effective in their configurations or were no longer required. For the sampled CCSDs, the report identified 84 (43.5 percent) circuits as candidates for potential reconfiguration. Leases for eight (4.1 percent) other circuits could be terminated because they were no longer required. The audit determined that \$8.9 million could be put to better use if circuits are either reconfigured or terminated in the San Antonio area during the execution of the

## Prior Audits and Other Reviews

---

FY 1994 through FY 1996 Future Years Defense Program. Finally, for that same period, about \$.015 million could be put to better use if one circuit that was not part of the audit universe or sample is terminated.

**Office of the Inspector General, DoD, Report No. 93-144, "Management of Leased Modulators/Demodulators by the Air Mobility Command," June 30, 1993.** The audit showed that the Air Mobility Command did not prepare documentation required to discontinue payments for modulators/demodulators (modems) no longer in service, purchase rather than lease modems, and disconnect circuits that were no longer required. As a result, about \$826,000 was spent for equipment no longer in service; about \$1.3 million was spent for leased equipment that should have been purchased; and about \$70,000 was spent for leased circuits that were no longer required. The audit also showed that at seven military installations, 53.6 percent of telecommunications equipment could not be accounted for and that the Air Mobility Command could not validate its telecommunications equipment inventories. Actions to terminate lease payments, to purchase leased modems, and to disconnect circuits would reduce costs by about \$5.3 million (of which \$784,000 was previously reported for Dover Air Force Base during the FY 1993 through FY 1998 Future Years Defense Program. We recommended that the Commander, Air Mobility Command, terminate payments for equipment no longer in service, purchase leased modems, disconnect circuits no longer needed, and conduct and maintain inventories of all leased and owned telecommunications equipment and services. The Air Force concurred with the finding and implemented corrective measures.

**Office of the Inspector General, DoD, Report No. 93-019, "Disposition of Telecommunications Services and Equipment at Eaker Air Force Base," November 6, 1992.** The audit identified telecommunications services that were not discontinued when service requirements no longer existed. The report states that 5 (10.6 percent) of 47 long-haul telecommunications circuits reviewed at Eaker Air Force Base, Blytheville, Arkansas, were no longer required. As a result, DoD could have avoided communications costs estimated at \$19,000 if action had been taken to discontinue the services. When this matter was brought to management's attention, it took immediate action to discontinue the circuits and avoided additional costs of about \$9,000 through December 1992, the planned base closure date. The Air Force concurred with the finding and monetary benefits and provided corrective measures to prevent similar conditions.

**Office of the Inspector General, DoD, Report No. 93-018, "Disposition of Telecommunications Services and Equipment at Pease Air National Guard Base," November 6, 1992.** The audit disclosed that existent services were not discontinued when communication requirements no longer existed. The report showed that 7 (46.7 percent) of 15 long-haul telecommunications circuits reviewed at Pease Air National Guard Base, Portsmouth, New Hampshire, were no longer required. As a result, DoD could have avoided communications costs estimated at \$151,000 if action had been taken to discontinue the services. When this matter was brought to management's attention, it took immediate action to discontinue the services and avoided additional costs of about

\$272,000 during the execution of the FY 1993 through FY 1998 Future Years Defense Program. The Defense Information Systems Agency concurred with the finding and monetary benefits projected in the report.

**Office of the Inspector General, DoD, Report No. 90-005, "Requirements Validation for Telecommunications Services," October 16, 1989.** The audit showed that 21 percent of the 1,323 sample circuits reviewed at 21 DoD installations continued in service although no longer required, were not cost-effective as configured, or could not be identified. For the sampled circuits, the report identified 135 circuits (10.2 percent) that were no longer required, 130 circuits (9.8 percent) that were considered not cost-effective in their configurations, and 12 circuits (1.0 percent) that could not be identified. As a result, leased circuits that are no longer required or not cost-effective may cost DoD as much as \$21 million during FY 1989 and \$117 million during the execution of the FY 1989 through FY 1993 Five Year Defense Plan. Several recommendations were made to the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Command, Control, Communications and Intelligence) and to the Comptroller of the Department of Defense, one of which was to establish a definitive policy requiring DoD Components to review and revalidate telecommunications circuits leased and owned by the Defense Communications System. The identification of reconfiguration opportunities was not discussed in that audit report. Management concurred in all recommendations in the report.





---

## **Organizations Visited or Contacted**

### **Department of the Army**

Headquarters, U.S. Army Forces Command, Fort McPherson, GA  
Fort Bragg, Fayetteville, NC  
Headquarters, U.S. Army Information Systems Command, Fort Huachuca, AZ  
U.S. Army Commercial Communications Office, Fort Huachuca, AZ

### **Department of the Navy**

Commander in Chief, U.S. Pacific Fleet, Pearl Harbor, HI  
Naval Air Station Alameda, Alameda, CA  
Chief of Naval Education and Training, Pensacola, FL  
Naval Air Station Corpus Christi, Corpus Christi, TX  
Naval Air Station Kingsville, Kingsville, TX  
Headquarters, Naval Sea Systems Command, Arlington, VA  
Mare Island Naval Shipyard, Vallejo, CA  
Naval Weapons Station Concord, Concord, CA  
Headquarters, Naval Facilities Engineering Command, Alexandria, VA  
Navy Public Works Center, Oakland, CA  
Headquarters Naval Computer and Telecommunications Command, Washington, DC  
Naval Communications Station Stockton, Stockton, CA  
Naval Computer and Telecommunications Station, Pensacola, FL

### **Defense Agency**

Defense Information Systems Agency, Arlington, VA  
Defense Commercial Communications Office, Scott Air Force Base, IL



---

## **Report Distribution**

### **Office of the Secretary of Defense**

Comptroller of the Department of Defense  
Assistant Secretary of Defense (Command, Control, Communications, and Intelligence)  
Assistant to the Secretary of Defense (Public Affairs)

### **Department of the Army**

Secretary of the Army  
Auditor General, Department of the Army

### **Department of the Navy**

Secretary of the Navy  
Assistant Secretary of the Navy (Financial Management)  
Auditor General, Department of the Navy

### **Department of the Air Force**

Auditor General, Department of the Air Force

### **Defense Agencies**

Director, Defense Contract Audit Agency  
Director, Defense Information Systems Agency  
Director, Defense Logistics Agency  
Director, National Security Agency  
Inspector General, Central Imagery Office  
Inspector General, Defense Intelligence Agency  
Inspector General, National Security Agency  
Director, Defense Logistics Studies Information Exchange

### **Non-Defense Federal Organizations**

Office of Management and Budget  
Technical Information Center, National Security and International Affairs Division,  
General Accounting Office

## **Report Distribution**

---

### **Non-Defense Federal Organizations, (cont'd)**

Chairman and Ranking Minority Member of Each of the Following  
Congressional Committees and Subcommittees:

Senate Committee on Appropriations  
Senate Subcommittee on Defense, Committee on Appropriations  
Senate Committee on Armed Services  
Senate Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation  
Senate Subcommittee on Communications, Committee on Commerce, Science, and  
Transportation  
Senate Committee on Governmental Affairs  
House Committee on Appropriations  
House Subcommittee on Defense, Committee on Appropriations  
House Committee on Armed Services  
House Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations, Committee on Armed Services  
House Committee on Energy and Commerce  
House Subcommittee on Telecommunications and Finance, Committee on Energy and  
Commerce  
House Committee on Government Operations  
House Subcommittee on Legislation and National Security, Committee on Government  
Operations

## **Audit Team Members**

This report was prepared by the Readiness and Operational Support Directorate, Office of the Assistant Inspector General for Auditing, DoD.

Thomas F. Gimble  
Robert M. Murrell  
Eric B. Edwards  
Patrick J. Nix  
Catherine M. Schneiter  
Brian C. Filer  
Phung T. Lam  
Gregory M. Mennetti  
Brenda J. Solbrig  
Cassandra E. Moore  
Annette J. Finn  
Amy L. Salerno  
Nancy C. Cipolla